



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
09/931,329	08/16/2001	Laurent Cohen	488-182	3950		
75	7590 08/26/2004			. EXAMINER		
Gerald Levy, Esq. PITNEY, HARDIN, KIPP & SZUCH LLP 711 Third Avenue			CHAU, COREY P			
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	New York, NY 10017-4059					
			DATE MAILED: 08/26/2004	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
A.M	09/931,329	COHEN, LAURENT
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Corey P Chau	2644
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY	Y IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MOI	NTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute,	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply y within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH: , cause the application to become ABAN	y be timely filed 30) days will be considered timely. S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	, date of this communication, even if time	ely filed, may reduce any
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 A	<u>pril 2004</u> .	
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	nce except for formal matter	s, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 1	1, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.		
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	wn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.		•
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.	•
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		•
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	` '
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		·
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		
1. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in App	lication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	-	ceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	caived
See the attached detailed Since action for a list	of the certified copies not re-	ceiveu.
		·
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		nmary (PTO-413)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4. 		Mail Date rmal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2644

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 2. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
- 3. Claim 1 recites the limitation "the type" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1, 2, and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6264355 to Ives et al. (hereafter as Ives).
- 6. Regarding Claim 1, Ives discloses an audio console (i.e. audio mixer of the type including multiple controls) (Fig. 2) comprising a joystick with at least two degrees of freedom thereby controlling two variables (column 3, lines 54-67). Ives discloses the control of panning in the console can be provided by other manually operated pointing

Art Unit: 2644

device. Ives also discloses audio "panning functions" are found in many prior art audio consoles which are used in recording or monitoring environments where changing the perceived physical location of sound is desired. For example, television and film production studios use multi-channel audio consoles which include panning joysticks, trackballs or other pointing devices which are connected to electrical and electronic devices which generate panning control signals representative of physical movement of the pointing device (column 1, lines 14-23). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill at the time the invention was made to utilize any known pointing device, such as a trackball, as taught by Ives.

- 7. All elements of Claims 2 and 3 are comprehended by Claim 1. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claim 1.
- 8. Claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No 5212733 to DeVitt et al. (hereafter as DeVitt).
- 9. Regarding Claim 1, Applicant's admitted prior art discloses an audio mixer wherein effects are frequently changed simultaneously, such as regeneration of the effect and the speed of the effect being used. Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a device in order for two controls to be changed simultaneously, such as regeneration of the effect and the speed of the effect being used so as to allow an operator to operate two controls simultaneously without it being awkward, as taught by DeVitt. DeVitt

Art Unit: 2644

discloses sound mixing device (i.e. audio mixer) comprising a mouse (i.e. a mouse comprising a trackball that can rotate with at least two degrees of freedom)(column 6, lines 9-22), wherein the mouse is used to control the location of an icon on the display; a controller that generates multiple parameters control signal that is based upon the location of the icon and is used by the circuit to control multiple parameters affecting an audio output. The states of the multiple parameters can be simultaneously controlled and usefully displayed, permitting precision and flexibility in a real time dynamic sound control and permitting a sound engineer to achieve complex mixes with a large number of parameters (column 1, lines 50-65). Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Applicant's admitted prior art with the teaching of DeVitt to utilize a mouse comprising a trackball that can rotate with at least two degrees of freedom in order to control two variables, such as regeneration of the effect and the speed of the effect being used.

- 10. All elements of Claims 2, 3, and 4 are comprehended by Claim 1. Claims 2, 3, and 4 are rejected for the reasons stated above apropos to Claim 1.
- 11. Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No 5212733 to DeVitt as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5060272 to Suzuki.
- 12. Regarding Claim 5, Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses an audio mixer comprising a mouse to control two variables simultaneously, such as regeneration of the effect and the speed of the effect being used. Applicant's admitted prior art as

Art Unit: 2644

modified does not expressly discloses a selector switch for selecting the audio effect to be used. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a selector switch in order for sound engineer to selector audio effect such as equalization, and gain, as taught by Suzuki (Fig. 1, reference switches; Fig. 2, reference 21-24 and 28-30).

- 13. Regarding Claim 6, Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses an audio mixer comprising a mouse to control two variables simultaneously, such as regeneration of the effect and the speed of the effect being used. Applicant's admitted prior art as modified does not expressly discloses a channel selector. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a channel selector in order for sound engineer to adjust the audio effect on a desired channel, as taught by Suzuki (Fig 1, reference switches; Fig. 2, reference 11-18)
- 14. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of U.S. Patent No 5212733 to DeVitt as applied to claims 1-4 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5060272 to Suzuki and U.S. Patent No. 4993073 to Sparkes.
- 15. Regarding Claim 7, Applicant's admitted prior art as modified discloses an audio mixer comprising a mouse to control two variables simultaneously, such as regeneration of the effect and the speed of the effect being used. Applicant's admitted prior art as modified does not expressly discloses a potentiometer. However it is well known in the

art that faders or sliders are incorporated on an audio mixing console, which is a potentiometer controlled, as taught by Sparkes.

16. All elements of Claim 8 are comprehended by Claim 5. Claim 8 is rejected for the reason state above. The switches of Suzuki turn on/off the audio effect (column 3, lines 32-47).

Conclusion

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Corey P Chau whose telephone number is (703)305-0683. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Forester W Isen can be reached on (703)305-4386. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

August 23, 2004

FORESTER W. ISEN
LIDERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER